

REMARKS/ARGUMENTS

*Drawings*

In his examination report, the Examiner was of the opinion that some claimed features were not shown in the figures. More particularly, the Examiner was of the opinion that the feature “an elongated support member having first end and second end, said second end being fixedly attached to said support frame” was not shown in the figures.

Consequently, the Applicant has amended claims 1 to 3.

In claim 1, the Applicant has replaced the expression “support frame” by “support structure”. The concept of “support structure” is broader than the concept of “support frame” as it comprises both the “support frame” and the “base support means”. The “support structure” is shown in Fig. 2 of the present application.

In claim 2, the Applicant has added that the “support structure” comprises the “support frame” and the “base support fixedly mounted thereto”. This amendment is supported by Fig. 2 of the present application.

In claim 3, the Applicant has replaced the expression “support frame” by “support structure” to reflect the amendments of claim 1.

Claims 1 to 3 are respectfully believed to be fully supported by the specification and by the figures as the second end of the elongated support member is indeed mounted to the “support structure” (see Figs. 1, 2, 7 and 8).

No new matter has been added.

*Specification*

In his examination report, the Examiner considered that the “sound generating means” claimed in claims 29 and 30 were not disclosed in the specification as filed.

The Applicant has amended claim 29 to now recite that the speakers are connected to the media generating means (see Fig. 3). The Applicant has also cancelled claim 30. The specification should now fully support the claims.

No new matter has been added.

*Claims*

Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 21, 23, 29, 30, 33-36, 38 and 39 are pending in the application.

Claims 30 and 39 are currently cancelled.

Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 21, 23, 29, 33-36 and 38 remain in the application.

Claims 4-10, 12, 14, 21, 33-36 and 38 are as previously presented.

Claims 1-3, 23 and 29 are currently amended.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 112*

Claims 23 and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC § 112, second paragraph, for failing to particularly point and distinctly claim the subject matter which is regarded as the invention.

Concerning claim 23, the Applicant has amended the claim such as to remove the recitation of the “cellular communication system” and the “Wi-Fi communication system”. Claim 23 should now be clear and thus fully compliant with 35 USC § 112, second paragraph.

Concerning claim 39, the Applicant has cancelled it.

Application No. 10/596,299  
Amendments Dated October 7, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2009

No new matter has been added.

*Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103*

Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 21, 23, 29, 30, 34-36, 38 and 39

Claims 1-10, 12, 14, 21, 23, 29, 30, 34-36, 38 and 39 have been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of International Patent Application Publication No. WO 2003/079319 to Langlois (hereinafter “Langlois”) and of U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2005/0048987 to Glass (hereinafter “Glass”).

***Declaration of Common Ownership***

Pursuant to 35 USC §103(c), the Applicant declares that both the present application and the Langlois application were commonly owned by, or subject to an obligation of assignment to, Pixman Corporation at the time the present invention was made.

In that sense, the ownership of Langlois application has changed to Pixman Corporation during its prosecution before WIPO. Confirmation of this change has been made by WIPO on September 1, 2004. As for the present application, an assignment from the inventor, Mr. Daniel Langlois, in favour of Pixman Corporation, dated February 13, 2004, has been recorded at the USPTO on January 29, 2007 (Reel/Frame: 018815/0404). Notably, both the present application and Langlois application have the same sole inventor, namely Mr. Daniel Langlois.

Hence, in view of the foregoing, Langlois application should not be citable against the present application. Still, should the Examiner found it relevant to the advancement of the present application, the Applicant is open to provide a terminal disclaimer with respect to Langlois.

Reconsideration of the present rejections is respectfully requested.

Application No. 10/596,299  
Amendments Dated October 7, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2009

Claim 33

Claim 33 has been rejected under 35 USC §103(a) as being obvious in view of Langlois, Glass, and U.S. Patent Application Publication No. US 2003/0172138 to McCormack et al. (hereinafter "McCormack").

Here again, as Langlois application and the present application were commonly owned at the time the invention was made, Langlois application should not be citable against the present application. Reconsideration of the present rejections is therefore respectfully requested.

*Conclusion*


Considering the above arguments, the Applicant respectfully requests that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case for all pending claims. However, should it be found necessary or practical, the Applicant kindly invites the Examiner to telephone the undersigned, Applicant's agent of record, to facilitate the advancement of the present application.

*Additional Fees*

Should any other fees whatsoever be due in connection with the present patent application, the United States Patent and Trademark Office is hereby authorized to charge any such additional fees to our Deposit Account no. 50-3436.

Respectfully submitted,

**BROUILLETTE & PARTNERS LLP**  
*Customer Number 56535*

By   
**Robert Brouillette**  
Reg. No. 31,930

Application No. 10/596,299  
Amendments Dated October 7, 2009  
Reply to Office Action of June 9, 2009

1550, Metcalfe Street, suite 800  
Montréal, Québec, Canada  
H3A 1X6

Telephone: (514) 397-6900  
Fax: (514) 395-8554

Email: [rb@brouillette.ca](mailto:rb@brouillette.ca)